

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims and claims 2-9, and 11-18 depend there from. The Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered in view of the following remarks.

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 10 and dependent claims 2-4, 6, 9-13, 15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Yang U.S. Patent 6,427,219 (Yang) in view of Widmer U.S. Patent 6,198,413 (Widmer). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

In paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Office Action, dependent claims 7, 8, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Yang and Widmer in view of Applicants' *allegedly admitted prior art* (emphasis added). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating on pages 5 and 6 that claims 5 and 14 contain allowable subject matter, however the Applicants believe that all of claims 1-18 are allowable. The Applicants respectfully traverse the specific reasons for allowance stated in the Office Action and submit that the claims are allowable in light of the language set forth in the claims and the totality of the prosecution record. The Applicants also respectfully traverse the suggestion that double patenting issues (as yet unspecified in the Office Action) may result from amending the claims. However, the applicants assert that the issue is moot because no claim amendments are made herein.

The Applicant sets forth in independent claim 1 a method for processing information in a primary communication channel. The method may comprise encoding at least a portion of at least a first word of at least one packet in a datastream and

reversing a running disparity of said encoded at least a portion of said at least a first word of said at least one packet in said datastream.

The Applicants set forth in claim 10 a machine-readable storage having a computer program stored thereon. The computer program may have at least one code section being executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform the following steps among others: encoding at least a portion of at least a first word of at least one packet in a datastream; and reversing a running disparity of said encoded at least a portion of said at least a first word of said at least one packet in said datastream.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 10, as admitted in the Office Action on page 3, lines 2-4, Yang at least fails to disclose a method and/or machine-readable storage adapted to reverse a running disparity of an encoded at least a portion of at least a first word of at least one packet in a datastream. However, according to the Office Action on page 3, lines 4-13, Widmer teaches the above recited feature and that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Yang and Widmer to arrive at the Applicants' claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

According to the Office Action, Widmer teaches (Figures 4 and 5) encoders that send block disparity to a disparity control providing coded data that is decoded by decoders that perform the reverse function of the encoders, thereby reversing the disparity of the encoded input signal (input word).

The Applicants agree that encoders and decoders perform opposite functions, however the Applicants vehemently assert that encoding and decoding is different from reversing a running disparity of an encoded portion of a first word in a data packet in a datastream. The Applicants respectfully assert that Widmer does not teach reversing the disparity of an encoded input signal, among other things.

The Applicants respectfully point to Figures 4 and 5 in Widmer cited in the Office Action, where Widmer teaches a running front disparity (+3, +1, -1, -3) and a running end disparity (+3, +1, -1, -3). The running front disparity is identical to the running end

disparity. Widmer does not teach, suggest, or disclose reversing the running disparity. Moreover, in column 6 lines 32-43, Widmer teaches that the vectors (coded words) are balanced, wherein according to Widmer balanced is defined to mean that the running disparities at the start and end are identical, *not reversed* (emphasis added). The Applicants respectfully assert that Widmer in fact teaches away from reversing a running disparity of a coded word and instead teaches starting and ending disparities of coded words being identical.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yang and Widmer, alone or in combination, fail to teach reversing a running disparity of an encoded at least a portion of at least a first word of at least one packet in a datastream as set forth in Applicants' independent claims 1 and 10. Therefore, independent claim 1 and 10 are allowable over the cited references. The Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 over the proposed combination of Yang and Widmer be withdrawn.

Because dependent claims 2-9, and 11-18 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 10, and because claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the proposed combination of Yang and Widmer, the Applicants assert that the rejections of dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 are now moot. The Applicants assert that claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also allowable over proposed combination of references and requests that the rejections of claims 2-9 and 11-18 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Office Action's assertion that the Applicants have admitted prior art in the instant application, the Applicants respectfully deny that any prior art features have been admitted in the instant application. According to the Office Action, Applicants' admitted prior art comprises an encode that dynamically resizes a number of words utilized for the encoding between a first word and a second word in at least one packet. The Applicants vehemently deny that the above-recited feature is prior art. The Applicants assert that all the features disclosed in the instant application are novel and make up various aspects and embodiments of the Applicants' claimed invention. The

Applicants request that the rejections made in light of allegedly admitted prior art be withdrawn. The Applicants assert that the claims are allowable.

## **CONCLUSION**


Based on at least the foregoing, Applicants believe that claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this submission, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at 312-775-8000. Please charge any fees due in connection with this statement to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy Account No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 5, 2004

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Fredrick T. French III', is written over a horizontal line.

Fredrick T. French III  
Registration No. 52,524

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 W. Madison Street  
34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois, 60661  
(312) 775-8000